







THE YORK CONGRESS AND CHURCH RITES.

THE
YORK CONGRESS AND CHURCH RITES.

[*From the "CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER," January, 1867.*]

BY THE AUTHOR OF
"THE CHURCH CAUSE AND THE CHURCH PARTY,"
"TWO YEARS OF CHURCH PROGRESS," AND "CHURCH POLITICS
AND CHURCH PROSPECTS."

LONDON:
JOHN AND CHARLES MOZLEY, PATERNOSTER ROW,
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

1867.

LONDON.
R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS,
BREAD STREET HILL.

THE YORK CONGRESS AND CHURCH RITES.

THE York Church Congress—sixth of the series—has followed those of Cambridge, Oxford, Manchester, Bristol, and Norwich to the region of past history, so we may make its memory the standing-point from which to survey some incidents of the Church of England at home. Two years ago, in speaking of the Manchester and Bristol meetings, we pointed out that the real success of the Congress movement would be tested in 1865 by the results of the Norwich gathering. At that time we were not without our apprehensions. The Bishop—himself a resident—was, at the first, confessedly not a very enthusiastic convert to the notion; Norwich Cathedral was not among the foremost in that reformation which is spreading from minster to minster over the land; and the occurrence of some difficulties in the chosen residence of Father Ignatius was not a wholly visionary anticipation. The die, however, had been cast, and in due time the event came off. All influences proved propitious. The Bishop of Norwich, resolved on being a fair, developed into a hearty, president. The Chapter, represented by a Canon of eminent practical ability and energy, was a thoughtful and generous host. Mr. Lyne was absent: good humour was predominant. The papers and discussions were of sterling quality; and finally, the Congress-book, admirably brought out by Mr. Hinds Howell—who as organizing secretary had won golden opinions—stood in brilliant contrast to the scandalously ill-edited, or rather unedited, volume which professed to be the record of the Bristol meeting. But above all merits the Norwich gathering carried with itself the ratification of Church Congresses as accepted by the Church of England in its corporate and dignified aspect. The presidency of the Bishop of Oxford at Oxford signified the secured allegiance of one bishop. When the Bishop of Manchester accepted the chair of the congress which was held in his cathedral city, and the dean and chapter opened the cathedral to the initiatory service, the recognition, as far as that diocese went, was made good. A similar recognition at Bristol was a fresh point gained. But at Norwich something more was achieved than securing the countenance of a fourth presiding bishop and a third dean and chapter. In a spiritual aspect the great united communion in

the cathedral (when the bishop celebrated) was to be noted with a white mark ; but in a constitutional point of view this congress was witness to another change in the upward direction which betokened success. At Manchester and Bristol the preachers had been deans—deans of renown, indeed, and pulpit power, but yet deans : at Norwich an archbishop was called in to be the preacher, and it was no secret that this was in preparation for himself taking the chair at the next gathering. To the recluse this might seem a small matter ; but to any one who has cared to study the episcopal thermometer, and to master the freemasonry of caution by which a prelacy, appointed for the most diverse of reasons, under different influences and by different prime-ministers, contrive to keep the peace towards each other, the appearance of the Archbishop of York in the pulpit of the solemn minster, preaching to the great church-concourse, after the public Eucharist, was the symbol of the hierarchy descending from the now-imperilled fortresses of class exclusiveness and throwing themselves upon the free zeal, not of a promiscuous herd of dissidents, but of congregated churchmen confederate in the unity of order and church-communion.

The formal recognition which had been so marked at Norwich was still more pronounced at York. The President was the Metropolitan and Diocesan of the province and the city in which the Congress met—the preacher, the Metropolitan of all England,—while the united worship which the Cathedral, through its corporation, offered, was an embodiment of Catholic feeling, such as we make bold to say no cathedral of England has presented, for we would rather not attempt to guess how long. On the first morning there was a plain early Communion, the Dean celebrating, which was crowded. The great matins service, at which the Archbishop of Canterbury preached, was heralded by a procession winding from the chapter-house and through the nave, in which, after a long file of surpliced choristers, and choirmen, and cathedral clergy, and then of Archdeacons and Deans (invited in virtue of their dignity to take their part in it), were a dozen Bishops of England, Ireland, the Colonies, and the American States ; and after them the Archbishop of York, who came supported by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Primus of Scotland. On the whole eighteen bishops and archbishops, three times as many as at any previous one, were present at the Congress ; but three of these were not in time for the procession. We dwell on this incident, not because we are weak enough to think that processions could regenerate the world or purify the Church, but because the possibility, and still more the actuality, of such a spectacle, viewed both in its ceremonial and its practical aspects, as what it was and wherefore it came to be, is a landmark of Church progress

which we should not forget to set up for the guidance of the future annalist.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's sermon was the best composition of his which we have ever heard. He had evidently appreciated the breadth of the occasion, and had prepared, not the elaboration of some specific topic, but that which approached, though of course rid of the monitory element, to a Charge, not, as usually, to his own diocese, but to the entire communion of which he is senior Bishop. The discourse did not attempt high flights of rhetoric, but it was impressive from its simple clearness and the manly good sense with which the preacher talked of things by their own names instead of beating about for oratorical amplifications. On preceding occasions, the special and official worship of the Congress as a whole, ended with the sermon. At York, on the contrary, the Dean and Chapter both for the second and third days of the Congress converted the usual ten o'clock matins into an early choral communion, at which the Dean was celebrant. Some 400 communicants availed themselves of this privilege each time, in addition to those who were present at various celebrations in different parish churches. On these occasions the clerks who took part, either in the music or as assistants in the distribution, left the usual stalls and were ranged antiphonally in the sanctuary, so the choir became practically a nave crowded with devout communicants. To conclude, on the night of that Friday, which was in fact, though not in form, a fourth Congress day, a densely thronged evening service was held in the nave of York Minster, at which the hearty singing of hundreds of voices testified that in one city, at all events, the cathedral, its ways and its privileges, are at last known and prized by the people. At this service an impressive sermon was preached by the Bishop of North Carolina.

It is not beyond our scope to notice that, within a few days of the close of the Congress, its selected preacher, the Archbishop of Canterbury, was again before the world as the chief functionary in another notable ecclesiastical ceremony, when he laid the first stone of the Cathedral at Inverness, for the diocese of that bishop of Moray and Ross, who, as Primus of Scotland, was walking by his side in the York procession. Grati-fying in itself as the incident was, and useful to the cause of Church progress generally, it has acquired greater importance, and has had its utility enhanced, by the silly outcry which the *Times* was misguided enough to raise against it, and unscrupulous enough to jumble with the hubbub which it was then beginning to stir up against the new 'ritualism.' So coarsely and ignorantly was the attack made, that the hand of the assailant stood revealed as one who, except in the *Times* and in his own conventicle, was

but little accepted as a prophet: and whose own civil position in London was obviously the exact counterpart of that which he refused to tolerate in Bishop Eden at Inverness. Accordingly, the *Times*, for once, found itself alone against the world, with only the *Record* to cheer it on; while every paper of the most discordant views which valued consistency, applauded the action of the Archbishop, and as many thousands heard of Inverness Cathedral as hundreds might have done had the description of its stone-laying been confined to the religious press.

The business of the York Congress was, as in preceding years, conducted partly in a central hall, and partly in rooms used for sectional meetings. At Norwich, the Gothic arches of S. Andrew's Hall, in which the gathering took place, greatly augmented the artistic effect of the *coup d'œil*, otherwise the acoustic properties of that mediæval rendezvous were very bad. At York, strange to say (although, throughout the eighteenth century, that city reigned as the undoubted social capital of England north of Trent), no room existed large enough to hold a Church Congress, and so a wooden Congress-hall with galleries was erected close to the minster. Picturesque in itself, this structure put on an ecclesiastical aspect when friendly hands had contributed the series of the armorial bearings of all the sees in Great Britain and its dependencies with which the gallery fronts were adorned.

Of the Archbishop of York's initiatory speech we need not speak at length. It was a very able and judicious address, but one which was rather devoted to ensuring the good conduct and success of the Congress in itself (which on the whole it quite succeeded in doing), than addressed to the Church at large, beyond and after the meeting. One passage, however, there was stood out, of general value, which brought down the enthusiastic plaudits of the assemblage, in which the Archbishop broadly declared the Church's right to convocational representation.

Both before and after the Congress, some persons, who are not the most absolute representatives of the Church peaceable, have been depreciating the York Congress, alleging the incompleteness of the list of subjects treated there, and the method of their treatment. We shall best test that charge by inquiring what really were the questions approached in 1866 and in previous years. We have taken the trouble to tabulate the various subjects handled at the four Non-university Congresses, not distinguishing between those which were treated in full session, and those which were remanded to sections; and where more than one distinct topic was set down for the same session, we have entered each separately. Of course the managers of each Congress adopted its own nomenclature. But judging for ourselves as to the subjects which were absolutely or approximately identical,

we find 34 sections of the Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia travelled over during those 12 days of 4 years. At Manchester, 16 several topics were handled, 20 at Bristol, 11 at Norwich, and 15 at York. 3 of them in different terms appear at all the occasions, 3 more at three out of the four, 13 at two, while 15 make a single appearance. The questions which have excited sufficient attention to recur virtually on every occasion are :—

1.—M. Church Extension. B. Parochial Subdivision, Organization, and Action; Collegiate Churches in great towns. N. Duty of Church to Home Population. Y. Diocesan and Parochial Organization.

2.—M. B. and N. Church Music. Y. Hymnody.

3.—M. Supply of Ministers; and especially native Ministers for Colonial and Missionary Churches. B. Foreign Missions and supply of Missionary Candidates. N. The Duty of the Church towards the Heathen. Y. Colonial Church and Foreign Missions.

In the second class was one topic which lasted on from 1863 to 1865, and then was dropped at York.

1.—M. Progress of the Church in Ireland. B. Mutual Relations of the Church in England and Ireland. N. Position of Church in Ireland :—

While there were two which appeared on all the occasions, except the Norwich Congress.

2.—M. Lay Co-operation. B. Home Missions and Lay Agency. Y. Lay Agency; and

3.—M. Ruridecanal Meetings, Diocesan Synods, and Convocation. B. Synods of the Church. Rural Deans and Decanal Chapters. [Noted at B. as separate subjects.] Y. Diocesan Synods in relation to Convocation and Parliament.

Of matters which only come twice up, we find at Manchester and Bristol :—

1.—M. Church Architecture. B. Church Architecture and Decoration.

2.—M. Free and Open Churches. The Offertory. B. Free and Open Churches.

3.—M. Augmentation of small Livings, and Tithe Redemption. B. Augmentation of small Livings.

Three that appeared at Manchester, and then slumbered till they were revived at York :—

4.—M. Management of a large Parish. Y. Best Method of attaching the Poor to the Church of England.

5.—M. Parochial Mission Women. Y. Ministration of Women.

6.—M. Day and Sunday Schools. Y. Sunday Schools and Catechizing.

Bristol and Norwich monopolise :—

7.—B. Increase of the Episcopate. N. Division of Sees.

8.—B. Revised Code and Church Training-colleges. N. Education of Poor in relation to Church and State.

Bristol and York have one common topic :—

9.—B. Social Hindrances to the Spread of Christianity.

Y. Social Condition and Recreations of Working Classes.

Next come a cluster of subjects which have come into prominence at Norwich and York :—

10.—N. Court of Final Appeal. Y. Ecclesiastical Courts.

11.—N. Cathedrals and Capitular Bodies. Y. Cathedrals—their Work and Influence.

12.—N. Duty of Church towards Foreign Christians. Y. The State and Prospects of Western Europe.

13.—N. Adaptation of Preaching to Present Times. Y. Dogmatic Teaching from the Pulpit.

Of once handled subjects Manchester gives us :—

1.—Supply and Training of Ministers.

2.—Clergy Discipline.

3.—Growth of Church in Lancashire.

4.—Law of the Colonial Church.

Bristol :—

5.—Dilapidations.

6.—Education of the Clergy.

7.—Systematic Cultivation of English Composition, Reading and Speaking.

8.—Associations for Aiding Poor and Disabled Clergy, and their Widows.

9.—Church Finance.

10.—Middle-class Education and Bristol Diocesan Trade Schools.

11.—Adult Education and Night Schools.

12.—Church in the Workhouses.

Norwich only offers :—

13.—Spirit in which the Researches of Learning and Science should be applied to the Bible.

York has :—

14.—The Sunday Question.

15.—Church Rates.

It will be seen that the three subjects which held their own through the full four years, have been the great questions of the Church at home in its parochial aspect, and of the Colonial Church in connexion with foreign missions, together with that special phase of outward worship which has such fascination in different ways, both for high and low, namely Church hymnody, dealt with either in regard to its music or its

words. Of those that were protracted through the first three congresses, the Irish Church, after producing a very unseemly squabble at Manchester, thanks to Dr. M'Neile's characteristic bitterness against the Romanists, was handled with peculiar ability and elevation of tone, both at Bristol and Norwich. It was, therefore, well not to risk a breakdown at York, by the fourth appearance of a fully-worked topic. Norwich, on the other hand, was noticeable for omitting the cognate questions of lay-agency and of synodical action, which were well handled at the other gatherings. The introduction of this discussion at York is no weak answer to the charge of shirking brought against that Congress. Our attention—as we turn to topics which only appeared twice—is drawn to the fact, that both at Manchester and Bristol, 'Church Architecture' ('and Adornment' being added on the second occasion) and 'Free and open Churches' (in the former place coupled with the 'Offertory') are prominent topics; while in the remaining Congresses they totally disappear. Thus at the two earlier assemblies the ecclesiological phase of the Church movement received due attention, while in 1865 and 1866 it slipped out. We fancy that we need not go far for the reason of this difference. Since the Bristol Congress the so-called 'ritual' movement had made head, and had indeed appeared at Norwich and York, in the form of an exhibition, and at the latter city also as a simultaneous and separatist congress; while upon both occasions the formidable Association, which fights the Free Church question with so much fierceness, also held a rival gathering at the same time and place as the regular Congress. The consequence is that, at all events, between 1864 and 1867, the Church movement, in its ecclesiological aspect, will have become apparently separated from the main current of congressional deliberation, and turned into somewhat turbulent and rapid by-channels. Some people may hail this diversion as the emancipation of honest opinion, for which we ought to thank the ultra-ritualists and the Manchester Free-Church men. We cannot subscribe to the optimism of this conclusion, while, at the same time, we are as little inclined to identify ourselves with the extreme caution which avoided the examination of those topics, rather than allow that open discussion, by moderate men, of such of the incidents connected with the worship side of Churchmanship, as would not involve the most thorny points of existing controversy. At the same time, it is fair to notice that the question of 'Cathedrals,' which makes its appearance in 1865 and 1866, is, to a considerable extent, cognate with the general subject of the theory of formal worship, especially as it was treated in two very able papers of the Dean of Ely. Again, the Cathedral question was heralded in 1864 by a paper and discussion on the collegiate

system in large towns, as contrasted with that which dealt with Anglicanism as a mainly parochial organization. Worship may not have been the most prominent consideration on that occasion, but the topic challenged the discussion of the due nature and use of those most important collegiate churches which contain a bishop's *cathedra*. The increase of the Episcopate was omitted at Manchester, but it had been handled at both of the University Congresses, and was again taken up both at Bristol and Norwich, so that its omission at York was not much to be wondered at, although, as it was so very practical a matter, and as the one Congress in which it had been passed over was the previous one in the Northern province, we regret that it was not formally entertained. Its omission created some disappointment, and elicited independent meetings during Congress days.

The topic of 'Ministration of Women' is an omission in the two middle Congresses, but it had been well worked at Oxford, and we hail its re-appearance at York. A somewhat remarkable group of subjects came exclusively before the two latter Congresses. We have already mentioned 'Cathedrals.' The appearance at Norwich of the 'Court of Final Appeal,' and at York of 'Ecclesiastical Courts,' is sufficiently explained by the Colenso case and Lord Westbury's infamous judgment. 'Foreign Christians' and the 'Churches of Western Europe' re-echo subjects which have most gravely agitated thought at home. The 'adaptation,' dealt with at Norwich, of 'Preaching' to 'present times,' and the consideration given to 'dogmatic teaching from the pulpit' at York, were the congruous counterblast to the flippant religious talk of the age. The masterly treatment of the latter consideration by two Irish dignitaries, in the eloquent and sustained argument of the Dean of Emly, and the perhaps even more eloquent and epigrammatic, if not so closely reasoned, speech of the Dean of Cork, placed this sederunt in conspicuous prominence solely from the quality of the oratory which it elicited, and the speciality of its having proceeded from a portion of the Church of which English churchmen are a little too apt to ask—Can any good come out of it?

Perhaps we ought to have grouped with the first-named of these subjects that session of the Norwich gathering which was pre-eminently the event of the Congress of 1865,—the one whose key-note was 'the spirit in which the researches of learning and science should be applied to the Bible.' Dr. Pusey's Essay, deep as anything which he has ever written, more lucid than many of his previous writings, was the paper *par excellence* of that morning; a paper which must have comforted many persons, by giving them a rational yet faithful solution of difficulties with which they may hitherto have been sorely troubled; while

it may also have relieved in a lower sense some others who, having themselves reached the same conclusion, found that Dr. Pusey's broad ægis was raised to shield them from imputations of irreverence from more timid brethren. The tacit consent of the Christian *orbis terrarum*, Catholic and Protestant alike, has in our own lifetime ratified the concordance of revelation and of true science by the recognition of the fact that the days of creation were periods of uncertain, it may be of practically incomprehensible, time. A fresh series of scientific facts has much more recently evolved bewildering difficulties in the literal maintenance of those very few thousand years during which the human race has hitherto been supposed to have existed. A little reflection was sufficient to show that no doctrine of the faith, no incident of scriptural history, was at stake in the discussion of the merely arithmetical computation of the probable duration of the human race. In fact, the more years we concede to the Genesiatic events, the easier we make it to conceive that the human race in all its diversity, ranging from European to Tasmanian, sprang from a single couple (the one great ethnological fact which has a theological value), and therefore that

‘Adam vetus quod polluit
Adam novus restituit.’

Still, in face of Dr. Colenso, pious people might well not like to be the first to make this acknowledgment. It was accordingly true wisdom and true courage in Dr. Pusey to come forward, in behalf of all the orthodox, and offer the admission. One fact, which he worked with much power, was conclusive, that by comparison with the genealogies of the Old Testament the consecutive fourteens of the first chapter of S. Matthew were confessedly arranged, for reasons which we cannot grasp, in their symmetrical succession by the omission of actual links.

It might at first sight seem surprising that ‘Clergy-discipline’ and the ‘Law of the Colonial Church’ having been taken up at Manchester should afterwards have been dropped—but in fact analogous questions have been discussed at later dates, though we would not quite group the previous subjects as equivalents with any later discussion. The growth of the Church in Lancashire was a local specialty like which we wish there had been more on other occasions. The only similar topic which we can discover is the paper on the Bristol Diocesan Trade School. The practical character of the remaining once-introduced topics at the Bristol Congress, which we need not again recite, is a merit to be noted. The consideration of the relation of learning and science to the Bible was the only solitary topic which distinguished Norwich, while the ‘Sunday question’ and ‘Church

Rates,' which are alone recorded against the York Congress in this class, were not its most felicitous elements.

An extempore feature was introduced into the York gathering by the invitation from the Working Men's Association for the Congress to meet and address it. In consequence, the Congress Hall was crowded with workmen, accompanied with their wives, who were successively addressed by chosen speakers, such as the Archbishop of York and the Dean of Cork. The attention of the hearers was exemplary, and the speeches of a decidedly good quality. All we wished for was, that there should have been a little more distinct allusion to the Church as such, if only as a social organization. When the working men ask a Church gathering, as such, to address them, the time had surely come to show them inoffensively and tolerantly, but still boldly, that the Church, as such, was in every way an institution which was of great benefit to themselves, and of which they would feel the loss, both temporal and spiritual, were it to be removed. As it was, many of the speeches would have been nearly as appropriate if they had been delivered at a Wesleyan or a Baptist Congress.

Upon the whole we should say that the Manchester Congress was characterised in its choice of subjects by a bold, though rather unsystematic, grasp of large questions; that of Bristol by the desire to realize practical points; Norwich by a well-balanced system of carefully adjusted topics; and York by business-like caution. After all, however, the bill of fare in any case, like that of many a Corporation feast, was more truly comprehended by the retrospective enquirer than the bewildered participant. As we have shown, the feature of the York Congress which will stamp it with individuality, was the fulness of the recognition which it won from the Church itself in its established dignity. As three days cannot cover every thing, it was worth making the list of subjects which secured the Primate of All England as preacher in York Minster, less than five years after the first little Congress gathered at Cambridge in King's College Hall.

We have called attention to the discussion on the ministration of women. Not many weeks after the discussion, the Bishop of London's Charge, recognising the need and the work of 'Sisters of Mercy,' *eo nomine*, was delivered.

'Time was, and not long ago, when Roman Catholics were supposed to have a monopoly of Sisters of Mercy: when Protestants all held that women might work as true Sisters of Mercy (and thank God they can), one by one, from their own homes, visiting amongst the poor and desolate in their own neighbourhood; but that the system of our Church forbade any organization for a combined effort to use the services of women. The fearful emergency of the Crimean war dispelled this theory. Other efforts were doubtless being made before, but that melancholy time changed public opinion. The heroic spirit

who stood forth to guide, and those no less brave who seconded her efforts, told the world that English Churchwomen were ready to combine, where combination was needed, for any great Christian work; and our hospitals will probably always henceforward bear more and more, the better they are administered, the impress of that great example. Now I should be false to all good feeling if I did not publicly testify to the great help which London received, during the late appalling sickness, from the self-denying efforts of Christian women—some acting alone, on the impulse of their own individual generous nature, some living in communities, of which it is the common bond to be ready, for Christ's sake, to tend the poor at whatever risk. . . . But no doubt those Christian women who work in communities are still viewed, by the great majority of the clergy, with considerable suspicion. Would to God they would abstain from all practices which make these suspicions reasonable! The number of sisterhoods of the Church of England throughout the country is very great. The deaconesses who form themselves on the model of the Protestant Institution of Kaiserswerth are, so far as I can ascertain, as yet comparatively few. The time has, I think, come, when the clergy generally and the heads of the Church must enter fully into the question how the help of Christian women living in community, and holding themselves ready to act amongst the sick and poor, is to be best arranged. We have amongst us a large body earnestly desirous of giving themselves to such work. . . . If family duties are overlooked, God's blessing can never be expected on any efforts which we may make for His Church. Every community, therefore, of sisters or deaconesses ought to consist of persons who have fully satisfied all family obligations. Again all who enter such communities must be at full liberty to leave them so soon as the leadings of God's providence point to another sphere of Christian duty. Hence all vows of continuing in the community, actually taken or mentally implied, are wrong. Again, the rules of the community must be simple and carefully guarded, so as to check all imperiousness in the higher, and all unworthy and unchristian servile submission in the lower, members. Again, great care must be taken to guard against morbid religious feelings and opinions, which all experience shows such communities have a tendency to foster.'

These are the words of a non-High-Church Bishop, won, unwillingly it may be at first to his convictions, by the pleadings of practical necessity; every thing therefore which he says in approbation is doubly valuable, while his warnings deserve respect, as the original criticism of an acute bystander. Anxious as we are to attain the general recognition of woman's united action under religious rule, in works of religion and mercy within the Church of England, we feel bound to call attention to the difficulties attendant on the organization of any system under which female societies can act with usefulness and success. Those who undertake to frame its constitution have, on the one hand, to avoid any occult love of spiritual power, and on the other to beware of that romanticism which is apt to colour the joint action of men and women, even when it is of the purest and most sacred character, if not to permeate the inner daily life of the Sisterhood itself. Accordingly we commend these remarks of the Bishop of London, not to the acceptance, but to the calm consideration, of all who are actively engaged in the development of

Anglican sisterhoods. On one point we do not hesitate to declare our adhesion to his warnings. So long as the Church of England so emphatically ignores, and the spirit of religious people throughout the land is so unmistakeably opposed to vows, it is suicidal in policy and indefensible in principle, to underlay the recognised constitution of sisterhoods with any clandestine obligation of vows, imposed by the stronger upon the weaker side. Between the *disciplina arcana*, which must be maintained by the imposer over the taker of the vow, and the conflicting external manifestations of spontaneous partnership which would have to be kept up by the Sisterhood to the uninitiated world, those must be feminine minds of the stoutest stuff which would not occasionally be led to feel that the path of straightforward duty within the community was rough and narrow.

It would be cowardice to take leave of the York Congress without referring to a very vigorous force of irregular volunteers who chose that city as the scene, and the Congress days as the time, of their operations. The exhibition of Ecclesiastical Art held in the spacious brick mansion of some Yorkshire magnate of the eighteenth century, with its attendant lectures and discussions, was the sequel of a similar appendage to the Norwich Congress. This year's display was, however, larger and more varied than that of its precursor; while archaeology supplemented the array of modern chasubles in use, or for sale, with contributions of which not the least important were the Westminster copes, lent by the Dean and Chapter of the Abbey; and the papers and discussions, which were a novel incident, were carefully reported in the newspapers. As we have hinted already, the growth of the 'Ritual' movement may have had something to do with the absence of ecclesiology from the more recent congresses. At first sight, the new ceremonial seemed, from its York manifestation, to be carrying the day before it. It had, since the report, on the whole favourable, of the Committee of the Lower House of Convocation, gone on with only a little outside complaint of clerical coteries, and its bold display on the occasion was like a triumphal rejoicing. In the few weeks, however, that have intervened, the British lion has fairly been lashed up into a perturbation which, whether the result of genuine deep feeling, or of the strong desire to catch at some counter-excitement to banish the disagreeable images of Bright and Beales, cannot assuredly be dismissed with contempt by any one who desires to see the revival of Catholic principles in the worship, as well as in the doctrine, of the Church of England guarded from molestation during this season of popular agitation.

We hardly need say that we have never admitted the claims which the chiefs of the new ceremonial pertinaciously urge, to be

accepted as the leaders of the High Church movement. They may be right or wrong, wise or unwise, scholars or sciolists; but the allegiance they have a right to is only that which they may win for themselves by the truthfulness, wisdom, and honesty of their principles, while their errors are not to be charged upon that great school of thought whose leaders have during the last thirty-four years conducted the Church revival, through many moving accidents, to its present level of success. At the outset, we protest against the term 'ritual' as the accepted definition of their peculiarities, and against their naming themselves as the distinctive 'ritualists,' not only because the word 'ritual' as meaning 'ceremonial' is a mistake, but because, in the exclusive sense in which it is used by these new ceremonialists, it involves something like a repudiation of those multitudinous labours of love—in recasting Church arrangements, and developing choral services and reverential Eucharists—which have, for nearly thirty years, taxed the intellects and gladdened the hearts of so many loyal children of the Church.

Upon the abstract points at issue we desire to speak plainly. We never had any doubt that the Rubric of 1662, in its natural and unsophistical meaning, legalized neither more nor less than the vestments ordered in the First Prayer-book of Edward VI.—viz. a white alb, plain, with a vestment or cope, for the priest who celebrates at the Holy Communion, and an alb with tunicle for his assistants.

The opinions of the nine counsel consulted by the English Church Union, accordingly, sound to us as confirmatory rather of the candour of the Chief Baron, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, the Queen's Advocate, the Attorney-General of Lancaster, Mr. Coleridge, and their companions, than as dicta which tell us anything of which we were previously ignorant. They certainly do not help us to understand the greatest of mysteries—the contrary opinion of Lord Justice Cairns and Sir Roundell Palmer. That these vestments are in themselves popish has always seemed to us a ridiculous calumny, seeing not only that vestments are of universal use in the Eastern Church, which is so antagonistic to Rome, but that in its Western form the chasuble is the prescribed vesture of the Lutheran communities of Sweden, Norway,¹ and Denmark. It stands in this respect in the same

¹ Mr. Forester, in his interesting 'Travels in Norway,' published in 1850, describes a Sunday which he passed in the summer of 1848, at the village of Lillehammer, when he was present at the celebration of the Holy Communion according to the Norwegian ceremonial. 'The priest having returned to the altar, the præcentor invested him, over the surplice, with a rich vestment or cope [chasuble] of crimson satin, embroidered with a broad cross of silver tissue before and behind.' Mr. Forester adds in a note, 'I had seen them of velvet with gold embroidery, but the colour was invariably crimson.' Of course, his journey having been made in

category as the altar crucifix and lighted candles, which are also of obligation in the 'Evangelical Church' of Prussia, and elsewhere in Germany. As a matter of propriety, we quite agree with the Bishop of Oxford in his late Charge, that a distinctive dress for the celebrant at the Eucharist is seemly and desirable. Having said all this, not as a concession, but as the expression of convictions which we held years before the recent excitement, we may be allowed, without suspicion, to express our grave apprehensions at the results to which the authors of that excitement may lead the Church of England—results which ought to be as much objects of dread to them as to ourselves. These are not times in which the immutability and irrefragability of any statutable enactment—*such as the rubric is in its secular aspect*—can safely be assumed by any party as its vantage-ground for straining the application of that enactment, to its utmost legal limit, in the teeth of persons who bear no goodwill to the enactment in itself, and who know that constitutionally the same power which enacted can also repeal. Vestments legal, yet dormant, may not be a satisfactory con-

summer, he is not a witness as to, *e.g.* the Lenten colour. Further on he explains that wafer bread is used, while his own summing-up of the whole question—that of an educated and right-minded, but apparently not peculiarly theological English traveller of eighteen years back, when even S. Barnabas was still non-existent—is:— 'As to the assumption of an additional and peculiar vestment in the celebration of the Eucharist, I believe the *cope* is recognised, and has been in use in our own Church *since the Reformation*.' (The italics are the author's.) 'The use of the wafer, instead of leavened bread, is surely a matter of little importance; perhaps it is more consonant to the usage of the primitive Church and the original institution of the Sacrament.' It is obvious all through the long description from which we have taken these brief extracts, that any question of the validity of Norwegian orders had never occurred to Mr. Forester, while he confounded the cope and the chasuble. We can give a no less explicit account of the ceremonial of Sweden, a country which, it will be remembered—although since the treaty of Vienna under the same personal sovereign as Norway—has for centuries had an antagonistic political, and a distinct religious history (with the advantage to Sweden of a presumably valid episcopal succession). The *Ecclesiologist* for February, 1852, contains a letter by Mr. G. J. R. Gordon, for some time *chargé d'affaires* at Stockholm, and now minister at Stuttgart, describing the organization and ceremonies of the Swedish Church, in which we read: 'The priest is vested in chasuble and albe, on the former of which, consisting of rich velvet or brocade silk, (and, if of the former, generally red, except in Lenten time, when it is invariably black, with plain embroidery,) is embroidered, on the back, a plain Latin cross, ordinarily occupying the whole length and breadth of the vestment; whilst on the front is commonly embroidered a large glory, with a triangle, and the sacred name, in Hebrew letters, within it,—also of gold or silver work, according to the season. Beneath this chasuble is worn the albe, of white linen, with a broad embroidered and vandyked, or fine lace collar, and sleeves tightened at the wrist, being bound round the waist with a netted blue silk girdle or sash, and having round the bottom a fringe of broad embroidery or lace. These vestments are put on over the cloth, cassock-like coat worn by the Swedish clergy, and in which, together with the neck-bands, they are bound always to appear. Swedish episcopal vestments are of far greater splendour' (including rich mitre, cope, pastoral staff, and pectoral cross). 'The rich vestments just described are worn only at the celebration of the Holy Communion.'

dition of things to the man who desires to feel them on his own back ; but vestments abrogated, and for the time to come illegal and irrecoverable, would be still less pleasant in his eyes. Moreover, we cannot blind ourselves to the suspicion that the inquiry which has been so peremptorily forced upon us may, after all, establish the fact that, excepting for the three earliest years of reformed vernacular worship, during which the First Prayer-book was in use, the ruling rubric of that Book has never received a more than partial interpretation, even by those prelates and clergy of Elizabeth, James I., and Charles I.'s reigns, who pushed to the furthest their own ideas of ceremonial grandeur. It must not be forgotten that the *continuous* formal existence of the non-Roman Church of England dates only from Elizabeth. The First Book contained a certain ceremonial, essentially and unhesitatingly 'Anglo-Catholic;' but in the same reign of the same boy, within a space of time to be measured by any one who will take the trouble of thinking what he was about three years ago, and of realising that it was three years since, it was replaced by another Prayer-book, edited under strongly adverse influences, while both books were equally, in another brief space, submerged by Mary's revival of the old system, which, good or bad in itself, had the *prestige* of far many more years than both the antagonist new rituals could together boast of weeks. It is accordingly but common-sense to own that it was *tabula rasa* at Elizabeth's accession, and that the actual force of the First Book, contrasted with its moral value, must be measured by the degree to which we can prove that it has been revived by Elizabethan and post-Elizabethan enactments. We believe that the person who duly considered these facts would have to acknowledge that, while copes have been, with more or less frequency, worn as Eucharistic vesture from the days of Queen Elizabeth to these of Queen Victoria, at whose coronation we, with our own eyes, saw the Archbishop of Canterbury celebrating in one, attended by the acting Dean of Westminster, also so vested, no undoubted instance after the time of Edward VI. of the use of a chasuble—however (as we believe it to be) rubrically and statutably legal—could be established. In fact, we suspect that, in the eyes of the seventeenth-century ceremonialist, the word 'vestment' had lost its technical meaning of *chasuble*, and was concluded to be an alternative or expletive expression for 'cope,' the special Eucharistic garb in which Andrewes and Laud, Wren and Cosin, were wont to brave the profane scoffs of the Brownists.

We do not assert, neither do we deny, that if a compromise had been offered, or asked for, or could now be effected, which should secure the unquestioned revival of the cope *simpliciter*, as the celebrant's dress alternative, and equally favoured with

the surplice and hood, it might not be well, under existing circumstances, to close with it as the distinctive Eucharistic 'vesture' of the Anglican Church. We shall not be tempted to discuss the possibility of such an arrangement even from recollecting that a writer of eminence in the new 'ritualistic' school has put his name to the assertion that proof exists that in sundry English pre-Reformational Churches the cope was the priest's mass dress. We only point out to the men of unflinching precedent, what might be the result in *non*-Puritan hands of the enquiry which they have been working so very hard to precipitate.

There are, however, other results, which no dread of ill-omened words ought to lead us to suppress, if happily we may, by pointing them out, win any enthusiastic worshipper of a single idea, viewed from a single stand-point, to a wider comprehension of the symptoms of the age. The result of a re-opening of the existing understanding might very likely be to place the settlement of the question not in the hands of the non-Puritans, but of the Puritans, who dislike from antagonistic partisan proclivities—or else of the Latitudinarians, who dislike from generic antipathy—both sacramental doctrine in itself, and of course also the external manifestations which exist on account of and in furtherance of that doctrine. Omit a symbolical rite, and you go far to obliterate the popular apprehension of the doctrine of which that rite is the symbol. It would be still more probable that these two classes of thinkers, finding that for the moment they had a common immediate object, would patch up an armistice and unite their forces to crush forms which are alike obnoxious to solifidianism and to pantheism. Would the people who belong to these two classes, and to whom any special Eucharistic vesture is especially offensive, agree to legalize and popularize the cope because their antagonists claim both cope and chasuble? Would they, with so fair an opportunity offered to them of meddling, be satisfied to leave the English service still capable of all the ceremonial amplification which it now receives, in so many churches where the introduction of vestments has never been thought of? They would have on their side all that peculiar strong feeling—not unmixed with a subtle, but deep-rooted pride—which makes the average Englishman always suspicious of the other Englishman who appears in some dress which he does not see his own way to put on. The surplice has indeed weathered its Symplegades, but after how many storms let the memories, on the one side, of Cartwright and Prynne, and on the other, of Laud and Charles, testify. Cope and chasuble, on the contrary, have not been fought and practically won on the many battle-fields which have shaped the

Church of England, but rather the contrary, and so those who desire to establish them will have to begin at the same beginning at which the wearers of the surplice found themselves in the sixteenth century, without the certainty of the same result, if Exeter Hall and the *Pall Mall Gazette* should unite forces to their destruction.

But some of our gravest apprehensions of the result of the so-called 'ritual' movement, proceed from another cause than fear for the result of a conflict between the world and the *bond fide* advocates of the full Prayer-book. We have made good our assertion that the attempt to revive the *summum jus* of the rubric—not so much from an abstract love of conformity for conformity's own sake, as from a liking for the things which that conformity would introduce—while abstractedly defensible, may practically be very impolitic, and provocative of great mischief on the side most disagreeable to its promoters; viz. on that of the retrenchment of advantages which have already been after an arduous struggle conceded to, and peacefully enjoyed by, the believers in sacramental worship, under a condition of things which has virtually compromised the personal adornment of the men for the embellishment of the fabric, and the regulation of the service. Such a policy, if it is to be pursued at all, must be done under the guidance of the greatest self-restraint, and the most patient caution. In proportion as the object is to reach nothing short of the absolute limit, the obligation must be imperative on the honest reformer not to transgress that limit. To be impolitic is a dangerous position to find oneself in. To be both impolitic and a trespasser into the fields where the law runneth not, is indeed perilous. Here, then, a new element enters into the consideration of the question as it is presented to us by the extreme wing of those who desire to confine the term 'ritual' to the ceremonies which they themselves specially patronize. We have begun by saying that as honest men we can personally, irrespective of questions either of policy as to their re-adoption or of intervening usage, give no other interpretation of those ornaments of the ministers, which were in the Church of England by authority of Parliament in the second year of Edward VI.—and are therefore still legal by the Act of Uniformity of Charles II. of which our present Prayer-book is a part,—than that of their being the much canvassed vestments. The nine counsel say the same thing. But the extreme ritualists cut the legal ground away from their own feet when they argue, as we have seen them do, with a pertinacity worthy of a more tenable cause, that this reference to the authority of Parliament in a particular year does not imply a certain book set up by a certain act of that year, but all the

collective mass of antecedent usages which that book was in great measure intended to regulate and simplify. We are not now entering on the much wider question of the virtual allowance of that which is not specifically forbidden. We are merely pointing out the impolicy of the attempt to distort what to all plain comprehension is a leading instance of specific enactment involving specific limitation, into the recognition of a principle which without such limitation could not be worked as part of the existing English system. The rashness of the proceeding is all the greater when the law which they are discrediting gives them specifically so much of that which they are seeking to obtain. We need go no further than this opinion of the same counsel for an instance of the spirit in which the English legal mind in its most friendly mood would deal with the question of virtual permission, by comparing on the one hand the consideration (irrespective of the results which they reached) which these eminent lawyers gave to the questions of wafer-bread, the mixed chalice, and of hymn-singing, and on the other the impatience with which they raised their voice against the legality of incense.

We are, of course, when we say all this, speaking as Anglicans, as men who live under the Prayer-book of 1662, and whose great ambition is to make that Prayer-book, to a far higher degree than it yet is, the living rule of Christian conversation within the land. We have not the illogical national vanity to say that all perfection is concluded within that service-book. We have on a former occasion stated points on which we should gladly improve it; and we could now—but will not—name others. But, in face of what it might have been in 1690, or at any moment during the eighteenth century, or even if compiled by the ‘old orthodox’ of the generation just passed away, or by any set of men in our own time, except that set which is most unlikely to have had the exclusive manipulation of the work confided to it, it is a priceless jewel. Touch it, and it will probably be spoilt—keep it, and the hope remains and grows that its legitimate resources will be further and further developed.

Plainly, then, we must state that some ultra-members of the extreme ‘ritualists’ have worked themselves out of the attitude of conservators of the Prayer-book as the palladium of our national Catholicity, into that of men whose feelings towards the book are identical with those of Mr. W. G. Ward towards the Thirty-nine Articles, viz. that of regarding it as malleable material which, by a series of ‘non-natural’ manipulations, they could work into forms unthought of by its compilers, but pleasurable to themselves. We seek, of course,

the representation of extreme 'ritual' in the second edition of the '*Directorium Anglicanum*;' and there, mixed up in inextricable complication with the revived ceremonial of the First Prayer-book of Edward VI. we find a series of usages which claim our assent, not because they were ordered or allowed in the ruling rubric, or in any other one, but because, in the private opinion of some of those who have brought that rubric into vogue again, they are Catholic and congruous. Of these we need only for example mention (not as the strongest case, but as one which is now prominently before the public) the revival, not of the sweet smell of incense, but of the overt gesture of incensing, as an integral element of the Communion Service and of other offices, which has just been declared to be illegal by the same consensus of eminent lawyers—who have allowed the vestments—with an emphasis of negation as trenchant as that of the affirmation with which they accept chasuble, cope, alb, and tunicle, because they stand written in that rubric, which is silent upon thuribles and frankincense.

We lay a strong intentional stress upon the overt gesture of incensing as contrasted with the combustion of incense, for there is a wide distinction between the two ideas, which the ultra-ceremonialists have somehow overlooked in their arguments. Incense, they urge, was a prominent element in the Jewish ritual; but it was found there as a sweet-smelling savour offered to God, and not as a lustration, so to speak, of the officiating ministers. To take up another very different line of defence, incense was occasionally burnt in the chapels of our prelates, and in some churches, and probably cathedrals, during the first century after the Reformation. But that incense, as it is quite clear, was burnt upon a kind of standing brazier, and its ministration was not a running accompaniment of the Communion Service. To come from the higher to the lower class of arguments, incense has an obvious practical value in all rooms, whether secular or religious, which happen to be stuffy: but then this incense need not be swung in a censer. Conformity to pre-Reformational usage is of course an argument of another kind; and from the standing point of the ritualists has its value in accounting for their practice of incensing. But we were purposely regarding the question apart from such considerations. The most complete example of the way in which 'incensing' can be attached without assimilation to the Anglican ritual, even as founded on the prescriptions of 1549, may be found in the way in which the new school amplifies the Rubric of Evening Prayer, which enacts: 'Then shall be said or sung the Psalms in order as they are appointed, then a lesson of the Old Testament as is appointed. And after that Magnificat (or the song

‘of the Blessed Virgin Mary) in English, as followeth.’ The analogous rubrics of all the successive Prayer-books are, we may note, substantially, though not literally, identical. In the earlier days of the Church revival, the battle of the choral service had to be fought in hundreds of places over the ‘said or sung.’ With the establishment of the natural meaning of the ‘said or sung’ came the recognition of a body of clerks to ‘sing or say,’ and of the surplice to clothe those clerks, while another rubric contributed the chancels, which were to ‘remain as they have done in times past,’ as the places in which those clerks, so dressed, were to ‘say or sing.’ All this may seem humdrum to the fresh young ritualist curate, who has entered into the harvest which is due to the energy of those who through much tribulation have ploughed and sowed for the liberty of choral worship for the Church of England. Such is the reasonable and legal expansion of this and of similar rubrics. Now let us see how it is handled by those who in the ‘Directorium’ claim to be the leaders of the party of strict conformity.

‘On Sundays and Festivals incense should be used at Evensong during the singing of the *Magnificat*, and additional tapers may be lighted. This canticle—a daily memorial of the Incarnation—being its special feature; some of those who are taking part in the service should indicate this by gathering together in front of the altar while it is being chanted, taking up, for the time being, such a position as that described here’ :—[A diagram follows] ‘the officiating priest having had the thurible and incense-boat brought to him by two Acolytes, may silently bless the incense in the following terms : “Vouchsafe we beseech Thee, O Almighty God, to bless ✠ and sanctify ✠ this incense, and grant that we who are permitted to worship Thee in Thy courts on earth may hereafter adore Thee for ever in heaven. Amen.” He then incenses the altar from end to end, beginning at the Epistle corner, going on to the Gospel corner, and returning to the centre, where, swinging the thurible from side to side for a few moments, he again incenses the cross, and then returns the thurible to the thurifer, who will proceed to incense (1) the priest officiant at vespers, (2) the assistant clergy, and (3) each side of the choir, and lastly (4) the congregation, first towards the north, and finally towards the south side.’

We must add that in the preceding page of the ‘Directorium’ the dress of the priest officiating at this ceremony is laid down as cassock, surplice, and cope, and that of the assistants albs and dalmatics—all of them, except the surplice, dresses only authorized in 1549 for the Communion Service.

We venture no observation, favourable or unfavourable, upon the intrinsic dignity or unction of this service—for such it really is, and not a mere episode—constructed out of the elements of the *Magnificat*, which the Prayer-book orders as an incident of its Evensong. We should strongly repudiate affixing any imputation of Romanising disloyalty upon the clergy who practise it because of their so doing. But we may ask what kind of strategists they be who have adventured to make good the practical realisation of

the entire rubric to its extreme extent, and who encumber themselves upon their sufficiently difficult march with such impedimenta—so bulky, so unassimilative, so provocative of suspicion on the side upon which the Englishman is most suspicious and most unreasonable. But, as we have already pointed out, it is possible that there may be persons who do not particularly care for the resuscitation of the full English ritual as it is written in the English rubric; but who are determined to realise certain practices because they think them Catholic, and because they like them. This position, if honestly avowed, is intelligible and consistent in itself. It explains many other peculiarities of the so-called ritualists. For example, it is the clue to the energy with which some of them attempt what the Puritans used to call ‘fencing the tables,’ by changing the great Sunday celebration from a grand common Eucharist of the faithful communicants, both clergy and laity, into a High Mass to be attended, but not participated in, by the laity.

But in proportion to the intelligibility of this policy so is its danger. It is perfectly idle to contend that this class of ritualists is conservative of the Prayer-book. It is infatuation to put them forward in the forefront of the battle against Puritan innovators, for they are, in their way, as complete ‘revisionists’ as Lord Ebury and his set, with the difference that the latter only talk, and the former enact, innovation. We do these ritualists the justice of supposing that they really desire to strengthen the whole Church of England, from their point of view, by effecting changes in the Prayer-book, which they have argued themselves into imagining the general Church will accept, while we are aghast at the blindness to the tendencies of the age which can have misguided them into the belief that a change in the formularies of the Establishment, provoked, as any such revision must be, by the joint agency of themselves and of the Eburyites, would tend to the advantage of any section but that one which desires to uncatholicise the Prayer-book. Perhaps there may even be a few among them who would not be staggered at such a result, but who would look upon the contingency as the opening of the Red Sea, which would lead them to the tangled wilderness of a ritualistic Free Church, regulated by the free will of the ceremonialists themselves, uncontrolled by pope or public opinion. This would undoubtedly be a most logical consummation of the ‘Directorium,’ but it would be most disastrous to the cause of God’s Truth throughout the land.

Here, then, we pause to appeal to the genuine and moderate men who have embraced the full ceremonial of 1549, because they think it their duty to show an example of strict conformity. We make this appeal, believing that they only want to make

good in their own case the liberty of the Church of England to use legal vestments, under the conviction that the English people have only to be convinced of their legality to accept them rather than try to change the law upon which the sanction rests. We further appeal to them, under the conviction that they may perhaps have also taken up incense, or some other unusual rite, as a corollary of the vestments, without much consideration of the difference of the respective bases on which the two innovations really rest. Are these excellent people certain in what company they are marching? Have they considered that the *plusquam* ritualist who looks on the English Rubric as no better than a row of pegs on which to hang his own imaginings, is in reality the most dangerous antagonist of their position of absolute conformity? Have they ever looked on their guides as men who have gone the furthest in actively shaking confidence in the stability of the *litera scripta* of the rubric? Those who have made good their recognition of choral worship, and of the due appointments of the Eucharistic office, including the all-essential eastward posture of the celebrant, have so far travelled along the same road, although, from motives of policy and of charity, they may be stopping short of their companions who think the time has come for the revival of the vestments. But the men who organize Magnificats with incense and varied attitudes, who add Corpus Christi Day to the great festivals, and who strain all their energies to the converting of Sunday worship into non-communicant gazing on a high mass, are travelling along quite a different way, which may tend to the indulgence of their own tastes, either within the spacious park of Rome, or else the little back-yard of a private conventicle, but which will, if allowed unlimited swing, undoubtedly arrest the healthy growth of external worship within the great old Church of England.

One instance of the practical working of these notions which has lately come to light is so characteristic that, at the risk of being lengthy, we must pause upon it.

There have been from time to time incidents in the Church movement over which we have sorrowed as the indiscretions of earnest and simple-minded, but unworldly men, who rushed into predicaments, or were entrapped into admissions, calculated to provoke the ridicule of a cynical world. Many of the proceedings of good hot-headed Mr. Lyne, for instance, were incommensurable with any theory of current common sense. But in all our experience we never recollect a circumstance which more clearly shows that religious enthusiasm may exist, and yet the perception of the possible and the congruous be absent, than the reception which has been accorded to that erratic Frenchman, M. Jules Ferrete, ex-Dominican, ex-head of a Romanist college,

ex-Presbyterian Missionary in Syria, ex-curate of Mr. Marchmont, and now *soi-disant* Bishop of Iona, by virtue of an alleged consecration by the hands of one 'Julius, Metropolitan of the World, who is Peter the Humble.'

For M. Ferrette we do not pretend to care. He is clever, and he is versatile, as other Frenchmen have been before him, and Syrians too, long ere the Franks had overrun Gaul—so these qualities are natural to a Syrianised Frenchman. We do, however, care for the credit of the Church of England, and inasmuch as a certain section of our own clergy have publicly identified themselves with his preposterous claims, we feel ourselves bound to show by his own confession what manner of man this Bishop of Iona who has come to rectify the catholicity of Western Europe *now* is. We say emphatically *now*, for his backers, at a certain recent meeting in Jermyn Street, where he was exhibited to those who chose to go and see the spectacle, vociferously asserted that the question was not what the bishop might formerly have been, but what he now was. We protest most roundly against the principle involved in this assertion; but in the present instance we are quite content to abide by its results. M. Ferrette as he now is, painted by himself, is quite enough for our present purpose, of seriously appealing to that portion of the Church of England, which desires to strengthen and extend the ceremonial appointments of our services, to consider whether they do wisely to repose confidence in any guides who are making themselves conspicuous as M. Ferrette's supporters.

We cannot deal more fairly by that gentleman than by taking him at his own estimate of himself, given to the public in a letter dated December 17, and published in the *Church Times* of the 22d, with the signature 'Julius, Bishop of Iona.' Accepting, for the purpose of our present argument, the statements of this letter, we are willing to acknowledge that he is as much of an 'orthodox bishop'—his own definition—as can be predicated of a French Roman Catholic priest, who after some thirteen years' conformity to Irish Presbyterianism has received, under unexplained and obviously irregular, if not clandestine, circumstances, the single imposition of hands of an ill-identified Bishop in Syria, who, by a process of reduction, must, if at all in *rerum naturâ*, be a bishop of that Syrian branch of the Eutychian sect which has vegetated on for so many ages as the Jacobites. M. Ferrette in fact, himself acknowledges as much in that letter, clouded as the confession is by a flight of incomprehensible words and unproven assertions.

Now, whatever may be thought of the virtual soundness of the faith of these Jacobites, they are tenacious, like all Orientals, of canonical prescriptions when not coerced by *force majeure*;

and as Syrians tell us in the newspapers, one of their regulations is that a 'Syrian' or Jacobite bishop must be elected by three-fourths of the male inhabitants of his diocese, and then consecrated by the patriarch and two bishops. It is certain that three-fourths of the male inhabitants of that interesting but remote portion of the county of Argyll, Iona, did not elect M. Ferrette to be their bishop, never having heard of him; and it is nearly as certain that Iona is equally unknown to the 'Syrian' episcopate; while in the third place, there is not only an absence of proof, but even a lack of assertion, amounting to proof on the other side—that 'Peter the Humble' was *not* the recognised Jacobite Patriarch whose residence is Mardin in the province of Diarbeker, in spite of his self-assumed pompous title of Metropolitan of the World; while, as M. Ferrette even ostentatiously proclaims, this strange consecration was a single-handed one. Finally, it is indisputable that at Homs (the ancient Emessa) there is no resident Jacobite bishop at all, whether Metropolitan of the World or of anything else; the nearest see of that sect being that of the village of Kurytein, on the borders of the desert, about two days' journey, or sixty miles, from Homs,—of which, by the way, the diocesan is credibly reported to have been in Rome some few years since, and to have engaged to conform with his flock to the Papal Supremacy.

Still we let M. Ferrette's statement, in which there is nothing materially impossible, pass; and we assume that some Jacobite prelate, of Kurytein or elsewhere, was induced to go to Homs, and there, under the turgid pseudonym of Metropolitan of the World, to violate the canons of his Church by a consecration, single-handed and clandestine, of M. Ferrette to a see in the remote Hebrides, long extinct by name, and already included in a diocese of the Anglo-, and a 'district' of the Roman-, Catholic Church, prompted and enlightened as he must have been in this grotesque performance by the urgency and instructions of the adventurous European priest, ordained in the Latin Church.

Such—to take the touchstone of what he is, and not what he was, either as Romanist, Presbyterian, or assistant in London to Mr. Marchmont, the dissenting sham clergyman—is the Bishop of Iona, who has been thrust upon us by the *crème de la crème* of ritualists, as a chosen instrument in the restoration of Western Christendom to the purity of catholic faith and practice. Happily this suffragan of the World has not been slow in publishing to the West what privileges he has in store for those whom he may be happy enough to gather into his own most sacred fold. Modestly putting himself on the level of 'S. Basil and S. Chrysostom' in his letter of December 17, M. Ferrette observes, 'unless the Apostolic succession has been interrupted

‘or the nature of the episcopate changed, the “sacred bishops” of our day have just the same authority of setting forth liturgies for themselves and their clergy as they had in the fourth century. If so, my publishing a liturgy is a legitimate episcopal act, fully warranted by ecclesiastical precedent *as well as by present necessity*’ (these italics are our). This Liturgy might have been, and we suppose was, in the hands of the Jermyn Street Conference; for it was not published at Homs, nor yet in Iona, but at ‘Oxford and London,’ by ‘James Parker and Co. 1866,’ in the form of a thin book, of 12mo. size and 81 pages, with the title: ‘Εὐχολόγιον. The Eastern Liturgy of the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic, and Orthodox Church, simplified and supplemented; containing Forms deemed valid and orthodox by all Churches for the worship of God daily throughout the year, and for the administration of all public ordinances, including Ordination. By the Rev. Jules Ferrette, of Damascus. Translated by the Author from his Greek Manuscript.’

A smaller forecast had been published, also in 1866, by Messrs. Parker, entitled ‘The Damascus Ritual, a complete Liturgy, extracted from the Greek Euchologium, and supplemented from the English Prayer-book,’ also by ‘the Rev. Jules Ferrette, of Damascus,’ and professing to be a translation of ‘his Greek Manuscript.’ There is besides a preface to the second book, printed as a small separate tract, in which the professions of the title-page are expounded, and the assertion ventured that M. Ferrette is the one single person who has renounced Romanism without losing favour with his former superiors and brethren. It will be sufficient for our present purpose to take the second book, while, at the risk of being tedious, we repeat that the person exhibited by advanced ritualists in Jermyn Street, and admirably upheld by the Secretary of the Association for the Promotion of the Unity of Christendom, and editor of the second edition of the ‘Directorium Anglicanum,’ was at the time author of this Liturgy, which, as late as the 17th of December, he defends in the columns of the newspaper which is especially regarded as the organ of the most extreme ritualistic party.

What, then, is the new and true Eirenicon? Of what quality is that elixir of love which this spiritual Dulcamara vends as the infallible cure for the fifteen-hundred-years-old quarrels of the Universal Church? First let us see how the Scottish suffragan of the Metropolitan of the World ‘simplifies and supplements’ the Eucharistic Office. The book contains a ‘Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper,’ according to S. Basil, for Sundays, and one according to S. John Chrysostom for week days. We will examine the former, which comes first, and has the fuller rubrics. The office is headed with a general rubric, which commences by

asserting that 'it is proper that the Lord's Supper be administered every Sunday at the end of the day.' No doubt this sentence has received the cordial approbation of those friends of M. Ferrette who make themselves conspicuous by the zeal with which they vituperate their fellow Churchmen who do not make it an obligation to enforce fasting communion. But then his Hebridean lordship goes on graciously to concede the 'lawfulness' not only of 'more' but also of 'less' frequent administration, 'and at another hour, if there be some special reason for it.' The ceremonial appointments may not be very gorgeous, but there is a fine simplicity about them: 'before the administration of the Lord's Supper there should be prepared in the church a table covered with a clean white linen cloth, upon which table is placed a plate, with a loaf of ordinary bread, and a cup of wine.' No 'pernicious nonsense' here, it must be owned—no stone altar, no frontal, crosses, or candles, no wafer-bread, nor yet mixed chalice, nor indeed altar, paten, or chalice at all; but table, tablecloth, plate, bread in the loaf, and wine already poured out in the cup. But we have not yet reached the end of this notable rubric. There is the apparatus—but what of the communicants and the celebrant? 'The communicants stand before the table, and the bishop behind it, the face of the bishop being turned towards the communicants, and the faces of the communicants towards the bishop.'

After this mutual introspection, we reach the Office itself, after the remark, 'the bishop says.' It must be noted, in reference to this office, that M. Ferrette's 'simplification' of Eastern Liturgies has resulted in his shaking up what he calls 'Public Service on Sundays' out of our own ordinary dry Sunday morning office, beginning with the 'One or more sentences,' and the 'Dearly beloved,' and ending with the prayer for the Church Militant (the Oblation being omitted)—the 'Gloria in Excelsis,' which is changed from the Western (without being converted into the Eastern) form, being tacked on. Accordingly, after the Versicles and Responses, 'Let us lift up, &c.,' and 'Let us give thanks, &c.,' we are introduced straight to an edited version of the 'Anaphora,' said by a 'bishop'—how dressed appeareth not—across a table, with a 'plate' and a 'cup' on it, to a cluster of standing 'communicants,' so managed, from the omission of any order of *manipulation*, that it may either be taken as containing a consecration of the elements or a mere historical recital of the Last Supper. This concludes with the Lord's Prayer, after which the 'sacred bishop' orders that '*the communicants sit down if there be accommodation for it,*' but 'the bishop remains standing' (why he should be compelled to put himself to so much trouble is not explained). After this, 'the bishop says—"The holy things to

those who are holy ;” ’—(and sitting, he might have added) ; and continues—“ God, be merciful to me, a sinner.” The bishop ‘ then takes the bread, and blesses it, saying, “ Blessed Be ‘ God !” ’—how this pious ejaculation is a benediction of the bread being left obscure. ‘ The bishop then breaks the bread, ‘ saying, “ Christ says : Take, eat, this is my body which is ‘ broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me.”

The Order of Administration stands as follows :—‘ The bishop ‘ then, with great reverence and solemnity, distributes the bread ‘ to the communicants. And if there be one or more deacons ‘ present, they help him in the distribution. The bishop com- ‘ municates last of all, as the Servant of the Servants of God.’ We shall not waste words by commenting on the parody of humility which characterizes the impudent inversion of all Christian tradition contained in the last order ; we simply place in contrast to it the following extract from M. Ferrette’s letter of December 1 :—

“ My episcopal character cannot be said to have ‘ nothing obligatory,’ for the priest Belorosoff [the Russian chaplain at Brussels], and for co-religionists. They are bound to recognise me as an orthodox bishop, though not as their own bishop ; and it would be a grave sin for any of them to act, speak, or write so as to impede my work. But it is just that I should bear in mind my own weakness as well as theirs. When Romulus, after much difficulty, had contrived at last to surround his so-called city with a mud wall, Remus, his brother, thought it a good joke to leap over it, and Romulus killed him on the spot. I will be more patient than that, and continue my work nevertheless.”

We thank M. Ferrette for the minute accuracy of his parallel. We thoroughly agree with him that *his* ‘ city’ of God is but a ‘ so-called’ one, and that its ‘ wall’ is composed of ‘ mud.’ We do not thank him for his patience, for, in truth, we do not care how impatient he may be, while we do not entertain the slightest doubt that he will ‘ continue’ ‘ the work’ in which he has shown himself so successful, of dabbling in mud. But in the meanwhile we are forgetting the Liturgy :—

‘ All having partaken of the bread, the bishop and people continue engaged in silent prayer for some time ; after which the ‘ bishop takes the cup, and gives thanks, saying, “ Thanks be ‘ given unto God !” ’

We call special attention to this passage to ask what it is which the consecrated of the Metropolitan of the World proffers to the Catholic Church by way of a consecration of the element of wine ? As we said, he travels over the *words* of institution in his Anaphora, but excising, as he does in that connexion, any rubric of action, they may stand there merely as narrative, otherwise we should have a double consecration of the bread. The words of administration are ours with a prefatory ‘ Christ says,’ after which follows a rubric, parallel to the one above quoted which

orders the bishop to receive last of all. Then follows a short prayer adapted from the Greek Liturgy, after which 'the communicants then stand up, if they were sitting, and the people sing, or the bishop says,' the *Nunc Dimittis*. 'The bishop then raises his hands and dismisses the people with the blessing, saying'—no formal blessing at all, but the normal ascription of grace from the second Epistle to the Corinthians. Such is the Eucharistic service tendered by this upstart wanderer for the acceptance of universal Christendom in exchange for its existing offices and rites. It is not our business to test it by comparison with the elaborate rituals of the East or unreformed West. Seeing the company in which we find Bishop Julius, we are driven to ask if it be so very superior to our own order of Holy Communion, even when most drily administered. In order to be quite fair to M. Ferrette we throw in his anomalous 'Public Service on Sundays,' as its earlier portion, and even then we find that, waiving minor points, (1) M. Ferrette never gives us any special Collect at all, and except on the Sunday before Easter, Maunday Thursday, Good Friday, Easter Eve, Easter Sunday, Ascension Day, and Whitsunday, no proper Epistle and Gospel—Christmas Day being wholly ignored in the Ferrettian use, as a Holy-day at all—and the 'bishop' having the choice of readings on other days. (2) That he omits the special confession, solemn absolution, and the authoritative blessing; in (3) That he orders the communicants to sit during reception, and the celebrant to receive last, and (4), That he throws the very consecration of the elements into inextricable confusion. The only Catholic increment which can be set off against this astounding list of defects, is the insertion of a prayer of Anaphora.

Our readers will not be surprised to be told that while in the order of 'Administration of Baptism,' the words are turned into the third person: 'The servant of God (N) is baptised in the name of,' &c., all mention of regeneration is excised; sponsors, other than as parents or guardians, are ignored, and the Lord's Prayer omitted—and that a prayer in which the 'bishop lays both his hands on the head of the baptised person,' appears to be the substitute for confirmation either as understood by East or West; while no ring is to be found in the 'Solemnization of Matrimony.' But we shall be asked by those who believe in M. Ferrette, What are his ordination and consecration services? Surely the prelate who is so wrathfully contemptuous towards Mr. Skinner because no drop of holy oil had touched his head, and who, according to uncontradicted report, is kindly ready to supply all that is wanting in the Archbishop of Canterbury's orders, and whose consecration, according to his own boastful account, took a good hour, will offer something very grand, imposing, and

full, not to say Catholic and Apostolic, on this head, though possibly rather lengthy. We are always glad to begin with praise, and so we freely and entirely acquit these portions of M. Ferette's book of circumlocution. By way of measuring the length of the offices, we have tested the length of each in comparison with a single exhortation (the first) in our own Communion office, and we find that while that contains 547 words, the entire form of the 'Ordination of Deacons or Ministers,' from the first word of the presentation to the 'welcome' with which it concludes, is disposed of in 343 words; the ordination of 'Presbyters or Elders' in 252, and the 'Ordination of Bishops or Overseers' in 463, neither Lord's Prayer nor lection of Scripture being ordered in any of them. The Deacon's office, according to the Lord of Iona, is to 'take care of the poor; to administer the property of the Church; and to relieve the bishop of all those matters generally which 'do not exclusively belong to the episcopal order;' and accordingly, while the poor Protestantized Church of England orders the Bishop to place his hands on the head of the postulant, and say: 'Take thou authority to execute the office of a Deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee; in the name of,' &c. the founder of the 'Orthodox Western Church' revealed to the *Union Review Almanack* substitutes this ample form of words:

'The divine grace, ever healing that which is infirm, and supplying the defects of that which is imperfect, promotes the servant of God (N) to the order of deacon. Let us therefore pray for him, that the grace of the All-Holy Spirit may come upon him. Let us pray the Lord.'

The 'Presbyter or Elder' is ordained with a similar form of words, 'Order of the Elder of his people' being substituted for 'Order of Deacon;' only—as the deacon has had every duty attributed to him 'which does not exclusively belong to the Episcopal Order'—the suffragan of the Metropolitan of the World judiciously omits any recital at all of what the 'Presbyter or Elder' has to do. Who that loves his 'Directorium Anglicanum' will not confess to the superiority of this office over the meagre formularies of the old English Establishment, which actually makes the bishop bid the new priest 'receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of hands,' and continues to give the authority of binding and of loosing sins? The similar words *mutatis mutandis* in M. Ferette's 'Ordination of Bishops or Overseers,' contrast as decidedly with the competing expressions in the old-fashioned Prayer-book. The office of a bishop being, we are told, 'to teach; to baptize; to administer the Lord's Supper; to read the public prayers; to bless; to

‘govern ; to bind and to loose ; and to ordain deacons, elders, and other bishops.’

We have, we venture to think, exonerated a great and good man from the grievous calumnies of the unrighteous and scornful. Author of such a prayer-book as the first-fruits of his Episcopate, M. Jules Ferrette was not traitorous to his old Presbyterian employers—nor yet a very dangerous foe to his still older friends of the Papal Church—when he sought clandestine consecration as the pretending bishop of a sham see of Iona, from the schismatic hands of a dubious Metropolitan of the World.¹

Our readers will have had enough—certainly we have had—of M. Ferrette’s liturgy. We should never have dreamed of rescuing the trashy *brochure* from its predestined obscurity for its own worthless sake ; but it demands notice on account of those who are the backers of its compiler. Are they Jacob or are they Esau ? Is it venison or kid with which they desire to nurture the English Church ? They are professedly and ostentatiously members of the same school which has brought out the second exaggerated edition of the ‘Directorium Anglicanum,’ and yet we now have them supporting, in the person of its author, this eviscerated Presbyterian caricature of the Catholic Liturgy. With what service do they mean to leave us after all—with the High Mass of the ‘Directorium,’ or the ‘Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper’ of the Bishop of Iona ?

This folly has its serious side, or we should not have gone out of our way to expose it, in the encouragement which it offers to those who see the surest way to working a Puritan or Latitudinarian change in the Prayer-book by bringing into contempt the men who seem to be parading themselves as Reformers in an opposite direction, with whom of course the standard-bearers of the Catholic *status in quo* are popularly confounded. We greatly regret that in his Charge (which contains so much that is good) the Bishop of London should have dropped some expression which might be taken advantage of by the men who are bonded together to un-catholicize the Church by altering the Prayer-book. It is true that the Bishop guards himself against seeming to favour any change which tended to affect the doctrine contained in the book ; and appears in what he said to have his attention chiefly directed to an authoritative explanation of the vestment rubric, or to meddling (a thing gravely to be deprecated) with the Burial Service.—We will test the policy of such an alteration upon

¹ A new edition of this book has since been published by Messrs. Simpkin and Marshall. The compiler not only proves his episcopal pretensions in it, but professes to have made some verbal alterations at the instance of his ‘brethren’ of the Eastern Church.

the principles enunciated by the Bishop himself. The rubric of which it is sought to relieve us—an attempt which never would have been thought of but for the precipitancy of the self-entitled ritualists—confers a theoretic legality by the Church of England upon the adoption at the great crowning act of worship of certain rich and distinctive dresses different from those which are worn at the less important services. These dresses are derived, it may be, immediately by that Church of England from the unreformed mediæval Churches, but they descended to them from the primitive Church. These are dresses which, with more or less of similarity, the Episcopal Churches of East and West, with which, thank God, we are still connected by the links of Apostolic orders, have from earliest times agreed in employing, and which are also employed from feelings of reverence by various Lutheran communities abroad. True it is that the permission to wear these dresses at all has, except in isolated instances, been a merely paper one. But is it not the instinct of all old and great institutions to be wary of abolishing prescriptions, even if apparently obsolete in practice, if they are conservative of some tradition which it would be wrong to formally abandon and explicitly to condemn, or which at some other time may show themselves suited for the occasion, and therefore spring again into wholesome life?

But would it then be wrong to abandon, and in abandoning to condemn, the tradition of these vestments within the English Church, and to make it impossible that they should ever again become a popular usage?

Let the Bishop of London answer this question.

‘To review, then, our present position. We are ministers of a Church which adheres to an ancient Apostolical form of government, not with the tenacity of a narrow exclusiveness, forcing us to look with suspicion and coldness on the great Protestant communities abroad, or on Nonconformists at home. We prize and thank God for this outward bond which—while it is some sort of link, however slight, with the unreformed Churches of our own day, whose errors we deplore and would gladly help in mending—ties us also to the great mediæval Churches, and the noble spirits who in them spread light in the midst of the thickly-gathering darkness of gross error: we feel, too, that it carries us up in outward relationship to the struggling Churches of the fourth and earlier centuries, and the great Fathers, whose writings formed in those days the best literature, not of the Church alone, but of the Empire. It is thus we prize the Catholic element in our own government.’

Memorable words these! especially uttered as they were by one of Bishop Tait’s school. But if the endangered rubric were put out of the way, they would be less true and, therefore, less memorable. In a great incident of worship, ‘a link, however ‘slight,’ which connects us ‘with the unreformed Churches of ‘our own day,’ would have been snapped—and our attitude to

'the great Protestant communities' of Scandinavia would become one of 'coldness and suspicion;' one 'outward bond which ties 'us also to the great Mediæval Churches' would have been riven, and a prescription 'which carries us up in outward relationship 'to the struggling Churches of the fourth and fifth centuries,' would have been annulled. Why this havoc? Because a few men may have striven to put this dormant enactment in use at a moment when they should have recollected that 'Charity was better then rubrics;' to quote the manly acknowledgment of the author of the earlier and more temperate '*Directorium Anglicanum*,' and because a still smaller set had tried to use the obsolescence of the vestments as an argument to introduce all other things that happened to please them, if only those too were also obsolete.

No doubt the attempt was made to let these vestments down easily, but rather contemptuously, by the argument used by the Dean of Westminster, that, after all, they were immaterial, inasmuch as they were but the crystallized dress of an ancient Roman peasant. This observation (into the archæological correctness of which we are not entering), so far as it was intended to discredit them, seems to us eminently unphilosophical, for the whole history of the Christian economy abounds with instances of the Church adopting common things, making them her own, modifying them to her needs, and then, when the fashion of the world changes, retaining them with a now hallowed monopoly. As well might the sacredness of the buildings in which we worship be impugned, because they were only the imitations of disused prætors' courts. As well might the Sacraments themselves be disparaged, because 'sacrament' was a word which at first only meant a soldier's oath of fidelity. We can readily believe that some such feelings as those with which we have analysed the Bishop of London's declaration, prompted the Bishops of 1661 to retain the rubric, although we see that the Bishop of S. David's, in his recently published Charge, goes far to charge them with disingenuity for so doing. Besides, the Bishop forgets that in settling the Prayer-book they had to do so not only for parish churches, but also for cathedrals and royal chapels, under one and the same rubric—a rubric propped, in their eyes, by the Canon which *orders* the cope in collegiate churches, and can only by a forced interpretation *forbid* it anywhere. At that moment any abandonment of the *litera scripta* would have imperilled that more grandiose cathedral service to which they had been accustomed before the Civil War, and which they might have reasonably hoped to see restored. Had Charles II. been even moderately fond of the public devotions of the English Church, it can hardly be doubted that his chapel would have been

regulated with a solemnity which would probably have at least re-established the cope and other enrichments identified with the 'Chapel Royal' of the Reformation: as it was, his selfish profligacy, followed by the perversion of his brother, had, even before the Revolution of 1688, extinguished that ceremonialist influence which in so marked a way flowed from the Sovereign's chapels during the reigns of Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts. But how could the Bishops of 1661, at the moment when Church and King had come back together, foresee the course of future history?

That with the increasing appreciation of external beauty in the minds of all educated men, with the growth of art in form and colour in all our buildings, the Church of England, if she holds firmly to that improved system of her worship, of which cathedrals like Ely, Lichfield, and Llandaff, and churches like S. Barnabas and All Souls', Halifax, give the tone, will not do something at the right time to glorify, in accordance with the rubric, the Eucharistic dress, we cannot for a moment doubt, if only she is left in peace to work out her own improvement. We are, as we have already said, very glad to see that the Bishop of Oxford, in his late Charge, speaks to this effect. Perhaps the present time might have been the opportune one if those who started the development had been as cautious, and law-loving, and genially English in their ways, as some of them are unhappily the contrary. If the development is checked, the reason of the check must be sought at the hands of those who drove it on so recklessly.

A testimony singularly opportune and weighty to this view of the question has reached us from across the Atlantic. The 'ritualistic' controversy has reached the United States, and seems to be agitating those cities in the North in which the Church is powerful. Accordingly, some clergy and laymen, headed by Dr. Dix, rector of the large, wealthy, and influential Trinity Church, New York, memorialised the 'Presiding Bishop,' asking for his 'views of the subject in full: especially as to 'whether an increase of Ritualism would be advisable among 'us, or whether the ordinary average of present parochial 'practice'—which in Dr. Dix's own case is, we believe, the moderate High Church, that for example of S. Paul's, Knightsbridge—'would best carry forward the great work of the Church 'in such a country as ours.' The Presiding Bishop to whom this memorial was addressed is an old man, seventy-five years of age, Dr. Hopkins, diocesan of the hard Puritan New England State of Vermont, conspicuous of yore for the strength of his anti-Roman feelings and language. Bishop Hopkins, in reply, set himself to write a book, entitled 'The Law of Ritualism,

‘examined in its relation to the Word of God, to the Primitive Church, to the Church of England, and to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States,’ in which, with many strong recognitions of the benefits of the Reformation and of the corruptions of Rome, he examines the question of ritual in the aspects of the descent of the Christian from the Jewish Church, the practice of the Primitive age, and the written law of the actual rubrics of the Anglican and Anglo-American Churches; and the result is, that in behalf of the latter and *à fortiori* of the former—while owning his own individual preference for simpler forms—he sums up in favour of the lawfulness, and of the edifying tendency in cases where it is acceptable, of a ritualism involving not only vestments, but incense; and even prophecies that it will ultimately prove the winning side in our communion. We quote the concluding paragraph of the book :

‘Enough has been written, however, and perhaps more than enough, to be a satisfactory answer to the application of my respected brethren. I have only to state in conclusion, that I am an advocate for Ritualism, so far as it is fairly warranted by the Bible and the law of the Church, and can make its way with the free choice of Ministers and people. It is not likely that I shall bear any active part in it, as my age is too advanced for my habits to be changed. But I have little doubt that my children will behold the “glory and the beauty” of our public worship brought back to the first stage in the Reformation, in accordance with the rule which has never been formally renounced, and still remains in the rubric of the English Prayer-book. And I trust that the work, conducted, as it should be, in the spirit of a pure and living Faith, and with the Christian grace of peace and charity, will add attractiveness to the cause of truth, and increase the influence of the glorious Gospel.’

We commend the whole work to that knot of the clergy ‘in the diocese of London’ who have found time to contribute their little share to the cause of dispute and suspicion, by circulating an address in which, while ‘not insensible to the objections which may be urged against such voluntary declarations on the part of clergymen who have already made the subscriptions voluntarily imposed upon them,’ they announce that they yet ‘are convinced in their consciences that the time is fully ‘come’ (to whom?) ‘when, for the satisfaction of the great majority of the lay members of the Church of England’ (when and by whom polled?) ‘and for the vindication of our Church ‘in the eyes of others,’ (what others, Romanists, Greeks, sceptics, Jews, or Zulus?) ‘some authoritative check should be put ‘to practices,’ &c. The memorialists are wisely vague as to the stringency of the check, and the authority from which it is to come: a box on the ear is ‘some check,’ so is hanging a man; but any body of laymen who should set about exposing some brother layman to popular contempt or odium by formally urging that some check should be put on his proceedings, and leaving

it obscure whether they implied a snub, a slap, or capital punishment, would be considered more anxious for their own notoriety or advantage, than zealous for the repression of the evil-doer. The memorialists continue—that the aforesaid indefinite check ‘should be put to practices which are confessedly introduced and maintained as symbolical of doctrines against which our Reformers protested, and in protesting against which many of the “noble army of Martyrs” “loved not their lives unto the death.”’

How can these gentlemen have the effrontery to say that such practices are *confessedly* introduced and maintained as ‘symbolical of doctrines’ against which Cranmer, Ridley, &c. died, and yet shirk recapitulating any one of them? We have already, not many pages back, given our reasons for thinking that sundry practices which may or may not be used, but which we speak of only as recommended in a certain book, are very unwise, nay, possibly in some cases, more or fewer, alien to the spirit of the Church of England—as alien to it as preaching in a black gown, administering Communion to whole railfuls, ignoring daily services, Saints’ days, and weekly Communions, and fraternising in public halls and Evangelical Alliances with omnigenous dissenters, confessedly are. But we never dreamed of saying that they were ‘*confessedly*’ introduced and maintained as symbolical of that for which Cranmer and Ridley were burnt, for if we had made any such statement we hope some avenger would have risen up to put us to open shame for daring to bring a charge so sweeping, so vague, and yet so damnatory, against the revival—opportune or not—of usages of which the most prominent are urged on the authority of a rubric in a Prayer-book put forth when the two foremost leaders of this ‘noble army of Martyrs,’ who ‘loved not their lives unto the death,’ in protesting against them, were respectively Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London. We have no patience to follow this protest through its next paragraph (a useless amplification of the preamble), which is simply a ‘solemn protest’ against all ‘doctrine and ritual’ of which ‘the tendency is to assimilate the teaching of the United Church of England and Ireland to the teaching and worship of a Church which we have declared to be “idolatrous.”’ ‘*We* have declared’—let the memorialists, as Dr. Parr said, mind their pronouns and speak for themselves. When have we done so? We have no doubt asserted that a certain doctrine of adoration of the Sacramental Presence¹ was ‘idolatry,’ not however even saying that it was a necessary

¹ It might clear the minds of the memorialists on this point to recur to certain observations of the Bishop of St. David’s in his recent Charge, on the term ‘Penance.’

Roman doctrine, but of the Church of Rome itself we had, we thought, only said what we also said of the Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, and Alexandria (*i.e.* the three *primitive* Eastern Patriarchates), viz. that it (the Western Patriarchate), with them, 'hath erred not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, 'but also in matters of Faith.' (Article XIV.) Finally, the declaration, having disposed of the Church in its spiritual aspect, settles its political standing in a brief and pregnant sentence: 'And we declare our conviction that the claim of our Church to 'be the Established Church of the realm rests mainly upon 'her fidelity to the principles of the Reformation.' In our ignorance *we* imagined that these claims rested upon the common law of the land, shaped centuries before there was either a Reformation to check the excesses of Rome, or before these excesses had reached such a height as to create that Reformation; confirmed by the Great Charter; and recognised by Acts of Parliament more than we can count, passed before, during, and after that Reformation.

We have not cast in our lot with the so-called 'ritualists.' On the contrary, we were taken severely to task by their organs for the plainness with which we have expressed our dissent from their aberrations. We feel accordingly more free to make our protest now, not against them, but against their accusers, as a body of men who have taken advantage of the follies of those persons and of the clamour of the journals against them, to bind together 'High-and-dry' with 'Low,' in a protest which might swamp chasuble and censor, but equally, in the vagueness of its vituperation, 'secretly strike at' any 'established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole 'Catholick Church of Christ,' which happened to displease the *Morning Advertiser*, or any other 'organ of public opinion.'

To persons other than these memorialists, who think that excessive ritualism ought not only to be checked, but thrown back, we would venture to recall the little damage which was done to the Church of England by that ultra-ritual movement in the early days of the Church revival, of which the foundation was the excessive study which the leaders of the advance-guard at that time bestowed upon the Breviary, of which the keynote was struck in the service for Bishop Ken's day, contributed by Mr. Newman to the 'Tracts for the Times.' It would carry us much too far out of our way now to give a minute account of this peculiar and interesting—and, we believe, now very much forgotten—phase of the movement. It is enough to say, that to us, who happened to have seen, without being implicated in, something of its internal working, the present manifestation sounds like the echo of a long-dropped strain. The

same extravagant adulation of the foreign and pre-Reformation—the same faith in the sentimental—characterised the two epochs; while in the men who ruled the earlier one, poetry, intellect, and unwavering faith in the virtue of their enterprise stood revealed. Well, that laborious pursuit of devotions whose ruling principle was the bountiful use of the Psalter, coloured by suggestive antiphons and said with accessories of æsthetic excitement, has died away—some of its most eminent promoters are lost to us; others, with sobered energies, are earnest labourers in our own Church; while, in the general spread of the daily service, we find the good seed saved from that too luxuriant harvest. Bear, then, we say to all sound Churchmen, with the present commotion, which may in its turn ripen into an expansion of weekly Communion. A change now will be a change produced, not by conviction, but by force, and therefore worthless, even if it be one which merely restricts the liberty of the present rubric to forms most generally familiar. We make little distinction between a change by judgment of the Privy Council, or one by Act of Parliament. Neither can be compassed under circumstances which can command abiding respect. The ‘ritualist’ will be exasperated, the advocate of moderate conformity and sober dignity will be indignant that the opportunity should not have been taken advantage of for screwing up the Puritan, while the Puritan will storm because the general level had not been beaten down, and the Latitudinarian will be generally disgusted by the entire turmoil. To the ritualist, on the other hand, we say as emphatically—be advised in time, and show the truest courage, that of daring to retrieve a mistake, and in the cause of peace not flinching from the unmeaning reproach of inconsistency.¹

In strong contrast to that of 1866, the Church Congress of 1867 will not even be held in a cathedral city. Birmingham was first thought of, but the cold unwillingness of the Bishop of Worcester defeated the proposal; so Wolverhampton, in the more genial diocese of Lichfield, was chosen, upon the invitation of the mayor, and with the promise of the bishop to preside. This large town is so near Birmingham that it will virtually sweep in the same body of local attendants. Wolverhampton, itself in the main the creation of its subterranean treasures of coal and iron developed by modern science and enterprise, will have nothing about it of that antiquarian picturesqueness which formed so powerful an attraction at Bristol, Norwich, and York. The

¹ The writer takes this opportunity of acknowledging, with much satisfaction, the conciliatory animus manifested since the publication of this article by Mr. Mackonochie and by the English Church Union. The resolution adopted by the Upper House of Convocation and substantially repeated by the Lower one will, it is hoped, restore the threatened ~~power~~ of the Church.

persons who go there from a distance will be people who wish for a Church Congress in itself, and desire, at some little trouble to themselves, to help it on. This will very probably thin the attendant numbers, but the change will be tonic, because the benefits of such a gathering are those emphatically of influence and information, so long as at a congress formal resolutions are forbidden. Care must be taken, in the long run, not to let the easy and social, nor even the archæological, aspect of the affair become too prominent. Deliberation with action is one thing; without it, it is another; but still it is deliberation, and should be respected in its graver aspects, such as we may expect in the coming instance, for it could not be expected that churchmen would make a three days' residence in Wolverhampton for any other end than that of mutual counsel.

There is one special aspect in which we think that the choice of Wolverhampton is peculiarly fortunate. There is no cathedral there. York, as we have seen, exhibited the cathedral element in our Church in an aspect of spiritual usefulness and majesty which must have surprised many of those who were present. The time had naturally come for the experiment to be tried how much could be done with a parish church in supplying the worship element of a general gathering. For this trial Wolverhampton is peculiarly well adapted. The church there had of old been collegiate, and till lately, while practically only that of a parish, had possessed that titular rank, the Dean of Windsor being *ex officio* also Dean of Wolverhampton. Now, in the course of ecclesiastical reform this harmless distinction has been blotted out, and it is only as other spacious town churches. The fabric was rather larger than the average of parish churches, but the choir had been replaced by some hideous abortion of deteriorated Italian architecture. As the church, however, lost in dignity, it regained in beauty; for a restoration of, we believe, a very satisfactory character, including the rebuilding in more seemly form of the choir, was not very long since consummated, under an incumbent who knows well how to work the church which he possesses. So it would be a strange thing if the solemn celebrations and public services, which ought to form essential elements of every Church Congress, could not be provided in this old collegiate church. The question of how to work the parochial system for the best benefit of the people was debated at York, in a discussion where the worship question received due prominence, a most friendly hearing being accorded, among others, to a clergyman well known for his extremely advanced 'ritualism.' At Wolverhampton practice may supplant theory. We venture to suggest that it might be worth while at this, the first congress not held in a university or cathedral city, to superadd, in some

form, the choral festival to the congress. The diocese of Lichfield has, since the institution of the Church-music Congresses—as we may well style them—been prominent for the zeal with which it has encouraged them, both in the cathedral and in various parish churches. Here, then, at Wolverhampton, when on the occasions of these public days the worship ought to be made all-glorious in a place destitute of capitular resources, the diocese might combine to furnish the means. One special introductory Service, and at least one specially solemn Communion, would, we have no doubt, be provided. But even on the other mornings, and in the evenings, something might be done to honour God in His sanctuary, and withal promote the study of Church Psalmody by strongly sustained Choral Services of a scientific character.

In this union of the outward manifestation of Anglican worship, and in deliberations not inferior, we hope, to those of previous congresses, the usefulness of such gatherings would make itself felt in a region where, from all we know of the growth of Church feeling in the populous towns of great and active Staffordshire, men's minds are very open to wholesome impressions. The Wolverhampton Church Congress might thus be made a pattern of that which we believe the ideal advantages of the institution to be. These are, in brief, the building up of the members of the Church of England, in no fanatical or exclusive sense, but with all their national characteristics preserved, into a holy people, attached to, understanding, and zealous for that Church to which they belong; not prone to take the offensive; tolerant and tender of the consciences and rights of others, but ready, at the faintest sound of danger, to stand to her defence; appreciating that, with a very wide liberty of individual opinion, the topics on which all who call themselves Churchmen ought to take unanimous counsel together, are as numerous as they are important; convinced, above all, that in the Prayer-book, as a record of things to be believed and an exponent of things to be done in God's honour and for man's salvation, is to be found for them the common bond of Christian union, and the common law of the acceptable service due to Almighty God.





